

Appl. No. 09/857,021
Amndt. Dated March 12, 2004
Reply to Office action of December 22, 2003
Attorney Docket No. P09843-US1
EUS/J/P/04-1047

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.) Specification

The Examiner noted that an abstract of the disclosure was not included in the application as filed. The Applicants submit herewith an abstract on a separate sheet.

2.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5 and 7 as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,112,097, issued to Subhankar. Whereas Subhankar fails to disclose each and every limitation of Applicants' claims, the Applicants traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 recites:

1. Arrangement in large Digital Enhanced Cordless Telecommunication (DECT) systems or similar systems, including several Fixed Parts (FP) connected to the same Local Network (LNW), each of said FP associated with one or more Radio Fixed Parts (RFP), comprising: means for assigning a unique Secondary Access Rights Identity (SARI) to the LNW when the first FP is connected, means within the LNW for automatically assigning a unique Primary Access Rights Identity (PARI) to each Fixed Part (FP) by deriving said PARI from a combination of an Equipment Installer's Code (EIC) included in said SARI and one or more generated bits, means within each Fixed Part (FP) for managing the identities of associated Radio Fixed Parts/base stations (RFP) each to have a Radio Fixed Part Number (RPN) that is unique with the Fixed Part (FP). (emphasis added)

Claim 1 relates to an arrangement in large DECT systems (or similar), including several Fixed Parts (FP) connected to the same Local Network (LNW), each of the FPs associated with one or more Radio Fixed Parts (RFP). Such systems are generally known in the art, for example as described by Subhankar. A problem is such systems, however, is that the handling of parameters such as Primary Access Rights Identity (PARI), Radio Fixed Part Number (RPN), etc., in a network with many FPs is complex

Appl. No. 09/857,021
Amtd. Dated March 12, 2004
Reply to Office action of December 22, 2003
Attorney Docket No. P09843-US1
EUS/J/P/04-1047

and time consuming, especially when adding or removing FPs to the LNW. Applicants invention overcomes that problem by assigning a unique SARI to the first FP connected to the LNW. Means in the LNW then derives the PARIs of each FP from the SARI. Moreover, means are provided within each FP to manage the Ids of associated RFPs so that each RFP has an RPN unique to its associated FP. Although Subhankar does disclose the allocation of the PARIs being centrally managed in the LNW, Subhankar fails to disclose deriving them from an initially allocated SARI as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is not anticipated by Subhankar. Furthermore, whereas claims 2-5 and 7 are dependent from claim 1, and include the limitations thereof, those claims are also not anticipated by Subhankar.

4.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner rejected claim 6 as being unpatentable over Subhankar in view of Sipila, et al. (US 6,278,880), and claim 8 as being unpatentable over Subhankar in view of Apgar (US 6,256,319). The Applicants traverse the rejections.

With respect to claim 6, the Examiner asserts that Subhankar discloses the invention recited in claim 1, but fails to disclose the additional limitations of claim 6. As established *supra*, however, Subhankar fails to disclose the limitations of claim 1, and the Examiner has not pointed to any teaching in Sipila to overcome the deficiencies of Subhankar. Therefore, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness for claim 6, and the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection thereof.

Appl. No. 09/857,021
Amtd. Dated March 12, 2004
Reply to Office action of December 22, 2003
Attorney Docket No. P09843-US1
EUS/J/P/04-1047

With respect to claim 8, the Examiner asserts that Subhankar discloses the invention recited in claim 1, but fails to disclose the additional limitations of claim 8. As established *supra*, however, Subhankar fails to disclose the limitations of claim 1, and the Examiner has not pointed to any teaching in Apgar to overcome the deficiencies of Subhankar. Therefore, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness for claim 8, and the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection thereof.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicants believe all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for claims 1-8.

The Applicants request a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



Roger S. Burleigh
Registration No. 40,542
Ericsson Patent Counsel

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive
M/S EVR-1-C11
Plano, TX 75024
Phone: 972-583-5799
Fax: 972-583-7864
roger.burleigh@ericsson.com